The Indian Interpreter

No. 2 August, 1918 Vol. XIII

EDITORIAL NOTES

The New Model

IT is impossible at the present time for any one to escape from the new scheme of reforms about which so many hopes and fears and passions have gathered. But if there is one thing that a true friend of India would desire to say to the leaders of her people more than any other in regard to them it is, ' Do not hasten to the judgement seat; remember the greatness of the issues; consider ere you speak, consider and consider yet again.' Lord Morley on an earlier occasion, less burdened than the present is with fate, warned Mr. Gokhale that only one thing could spoil the situation, ' perversity and unreason ' among Indian leaders of opinion. How much perversity and unreason there still is, and with no one of the calm judgement of Mr. Gokhale to restrain and guide! There is perversity and unreason, too—who can deny it?—among the leaders of British opinion in India and in England, and so the furnace of distrust and suspicion is fed full with fuel. People divided, as circumstances have caused so many of these two peoples to be divided, into two opposing and distrustful camps cannot any longer see each other as they really are. They look each at the other through a deceiving medium that distorts their features and each side turns away from an illusion its own clouded vision has created. A resolute choice of reason and of justice, a purpose, such as Mr. Gandhi calls for, to root out ill will, is the only way of peace and hope in solving a problem so vast and so perplexing. And let the foreigner put aside the expectation of gratitude, as though for some generous gift. Whether it is due or not for much in India's guidance

hitherto, it is not due for what is claimed as a right now and for what is given as being justly due. What the rulers have to see, if British honour is to be unstained, is that what is justly due is indeed given, and so given that India may go forward towards her new birth with swiftly gathering strength. Woe to them by whom offences come!

Hath God forgotten?

As the world still staggers onwards—as it seems—towards her doom and new tragedies arise above a horizon already so heavy with despair, we are moved many a time to cry, as saints have cried in days less terrible, Has God forgotten to be gracious? Has He cast us off for ever? Even for Jesus sometimes clouds hid the future and once and again His calm voice faltered. But at such times it was men, not God, that He had doubts about. The dust of the world obscured much even to Him and made much uncertain, but it could not obscure God. It is the Christian's part in such a time as the present to make sure of God and then cast himself with recklessness upon Him. That is what some one has called 'living dangerously', and it is the true life of faith. This is the kind of living which produces the joy, the triumph, the singing that ring through the later New Testament. The men and women even of these blood-stained days look into the bright eyes of danger and their hearts are high. God is on the other side of the flood. 'Let not your hearts be troubled,' says Jesus. 'Believe in God, believe also in me. . . . In the world you shall have trouble, but courage, I have overcome the world.'

ECLECTICISM IN INDIAN MYTHOLOGY

By the Rev. A. Robertson, M.A.

THE Ṛg Veda is frankly polytheistic or perhaps henotheistic except for an elementary kind of monotheism which is manifest in its latest hymns, as, for example, in the hymn which says that learned men give different names to the One. So we need not expect any thoroughgoing consistency in the Ṛg Vedic delineation of the Godhead; and furthermore the hymns have come from the hands of many poets who flourished at various times throughout a long period, so that multiplicity of Gods or of ideas regarding any particular God is the most natural thing imaginable. The same general statement may be made regarding the mythology of the *Atharva Veda* and of the *Yajur Veda*, though these show a slight advance in the direction of henotheism. The formation of the canon of Vedic Scripture is unfortunately shrouded in darkness, so that we cannot trace the development of thought from the minds of the poets to that of the redactor or collector. It might be argued with some show of reason that the hymns could hardly have been gathered into a single collection unless there had been in the minds of the first editors some idea that the hymns contributed to a single system of religious belief. But we may assert that the aim of the collector cannot have been theological in any modern sense; they were concerned to preserve such prayers and songs of praise as a right performance of the sacrifices needed. And the sacrifices in view are mainly such as only the wealthy could afford, so that we do not know much of the religion of the common folk. It is probably in the *Atharva Veda* that we find the chief deposit of the beliefs and ceremonies of the commoner people, and so far forth an explanation of some of the forces which were at work in the altering of Vedic mythology. It is significant that in the *Atharva Veda* there is a distinct tendency to pantheism which marks a stage in the consolidation of polytheism. So, too, it is not without

meaning that the henotheism of the *Yajurveda* tends to crystallize round Prajapati and the God Śiva whose place in the Ṛg Veda is not of the highest.

Though the Vedas are the oldest records we have of Indian religion they do not give us quite the earliest form of that religion. Some of the gods of the Ṛg Veda are already growing old, and like all old things they are showing signs of passing away. The disintegrating forces of time are assisted by the Vedic idea that the gods are born, and not many of them are by nature immortal. By the time of the Brahmanas some of the Gods have attained immortality through the practice of certain rites and virtues. Dyauspati Varuṇa and Mitra and the Asuras are of ancient lineage going back to the time when the ancestors of the Indian Aryans lived with the ancestors of those who wrote the *Avesta* hymns and even perhaps to the time when they had not separated from the forbears of the Greeks, Romans and Celts. The names of Mitra and of the Asuras are undoubtedly found in the land of Persia and the ṛta of which Varuṇa is the chief guardian enters into the roots of kingly names in Babylonia. Varuṇa himself has afforded philologists an occasion for endless speculation, but he is probably an ancient being though with Mitra he appears in the Veda as a youth. Indra goes back to the Indo-Iranian period, and the appearance of his name on a Hittite inscription indicates that he is a far travelled being. In the Veda we can follow a decided increase in his influence, and he shows a special facility for combination with other deities whom he displaces. He is finally himself displaced as by an inexorable law of karma. Iranian texts, Babylonian names and Hittite inscriptions do not help us much to understand the growth of the gods, and no argument can be founded on such facts, but there can be no doubting of the fact that all the gods who are most prominent in the Vedic Hymns have now disappeared from the worship of the majority of the people, and their place has been usurped by deities that in Vedic times were only secondary; indeed a chief object of modern worship is a symbol which is condemned in the Ṛg Veda. The most natural explanation of this change in the personnel of the gods seems to be this, that as the Aryan race spread over the land it absorbed other races to some extent by intermarriage or by conquest and by both processes it enlarged its pantheon. The process which we find perfectly unmistakable in the Roman Empire within historical times probably occurred in the history of the Aryan migrations.

There is nothing at all remarkable in the passing away of gods that have grown old, in this unseating of heavenly dynasties whose forces have been conquered. The noteworthy point is that while the gods themselves have passed into memories, the prayers that used to be offered to them have been kept in the imagination of the people, if not in their intelligence and their practice, as the truest and most sacred word that men have known. The gods themselves have died, but the story of the gods has been deified. And in this apparently supreme inconsistency of the Indian mind is foreshadowed its greatest effort in pure theology.

We are not concerned for the present with the process whereby the idea of prayer, the idea of the word, became glorified, so that it now stands for the supreme all-permeating essence of all that is. The process is interesting, it is intelligible, and it is perfectly logical and natural. But alongside this unifying tendency of the higher Hindu thought there is another levelling of distinctions that seems more consciously forced and therefore much less successful from a logical point of view. It is exemplified at a fairly early date in the *Nirukta* of Yāska, a commentator who gives etymological interpretations of about six hundred ṛiks of the Ṛg Veda. We find the tendency also in the Brahmanas of the Veda, books which Yāska is constantly quoting. Now Yāska himself has difficulties, and some of them are due to differences of interpretation that prevailed before his time. He 'mentions several different schools of interpretation, the Nairuktas or etymologists, the Aitihāsikas or legendary writers, the Yājnikas or ritualists, the Parivrājikas or ascetic mendicants. Each of these explained difficulties according to its respective bias. Thus he tells us[1] the various views as to who the Asvins were. "Heaven and Earth", say some; "Day and Night", say others; "Sun and Moon" say others; "two kings, performers of holy acts", say the Aitihāsikas.' From this it is clear that in and before Yāska's time there existed no uniform tradition of interpretation from the period when the hymns of the Ṛg Veda were still understood, but that on the contrary there then prevailed widespread divergences in the explanation of the obscurities of those hymns.[2] Sāyana who lived nearly two thousand years later than Yāska writes a more complete

[1] Nir XII. i.

[2] Prof. Macdonell in the *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, p. 6.

commentary. He often differs from Yāska, especially when the latter gives an opening for difference of opinion by stating contrary views. But Sāyana usually follows Yāska. The mental attitude which is thus indicated in the ancient commentators is also exemplified in the philosophers to whom the word of the Veda was of less importance. Two of the main systems are named mimansa or discussions.

Now this variety of interpretation, natural and reasonable in itself presents an irresistable temptation to eclecticism to those who look on the word of the Veda as infallible and who would also fain recognize as more or less orthodox the various mimansikas. The working of this temptation is clear in many modern minds. An example of it is found in Dayānand Saraswati the founder of the Arya Samaj. He maintained the infallibility of the Vedas while giving them an interpretation to suit the social needs and the mental outlook of his own times. He did not accept the existing commentaries on the Vedas as binding on any one. Those of Sāyana and Mahidhar he rejected altogether. Dayanand's follower, Lajpat Rai, accepts Yāska 'as admittedly the greatest authority' on Vedic interpretation, and he commends Yāska because he lays down the canon that Vedic terms are all Yaugika. 'A Yaugika term is one that has a derivative meaning, that is one that only signifies the meaning of the root together with the modification effected by the affixes.'[1] 'The Samaj accepts the Vedas as infallible and expects every man and woman to know them and to expound them for the benefit of others. As explained before, it leaves every individual free to interpret them for him or herself, subject to certain well-known laws of interpretation. The idea of progressive interpretation finds favour with some leaders of the Arya Samaj.'[2] Infallibility, Freedom of Interpretation, Progressive Interpretation!—surely a most elastic theory of inspiration. But the Vedas themselves, and the Brahmanas and that best of commentators, Yāska, encourage this frame of mind. 'Owing to the greatness of the deity', says Yāska, 'the one soul is celebrated as if it were many. The different gods are separate members of the one soul. And some say that the rishis address their praises according to the multiplicity of natures in the (celestial) existences. And from the universality of their nature the gods are mutually

[1] The Arya Samaj by Lajpat Rai, pp. 74–6 and foot-note.
[2] pp. 131, 132.

produced from each other, and possess the natures of one another; they are produced from works; they are produced from soul. It is soul that is their car, soul their steeds, soul their weapon, soul their arrows, soul is a God's all. There are three deities, according to the etymologists, viz. Agni, whose place is on earth, Vayu or Indra, whose place is in the atmosphere, and Surya, whose place is in the sky. These receive many designations in consequence of their greatness or from the diversity of their functions, as hotri, adhvaryu, brahman, and udgatri are applied to one and the same person. Or the gods in question may all be distinct, for the praises addressed to them, and also their appellations are distinct.'[1]

We may now note how these principles are exemplified in the cases and Brahmanas that honour Agni.

The sacrificial ritual would naturally contribute most to the tendency to maintain the multiplicity of the gods while at the same time regarding them as equally worthy of devotion; and this tendency would be strengthened by the fact that there were no central sanctuaries. The sacrifice was manifestly performed by the priest in behalf of some patron who required the gods to be appeased, and not as a great public ceremony to which all and sundry were invited. Now in most of the sacrifices the deity Agni played a part, for most of the sacrifices were burnt offerings. It would be natural for Agni to assimilate the qualities of most of the gods for this reason as well as for the reason inherent in the very nature of the God and in the multiplicity of his manifestations. As Yāska pointed out there was a tendency to group the gods into three classes, the earth gods, the air gods, and the heavenly ones. Now of all the gods Agni is the one who appears in all three spheres—he is worshipped on the altar and he is revered on the domestic hearth, he flashes along the storm clouds in the form of lightning when Indra urges his noisy car across the heaven, and he is manifest in the highest spheres as the sun and the moon. It is no wonder, then, that we find words like these in the Brahmanas:—

'Agni assuredly represents all the deities, since it is in the fire that they make offering to all the deities: to Agni alone, therefore, he should announce it, since he thereby has recourse to all the deities.

[1] Nirukta VII. 4, 5 translated by Muir Sanskrit Texts IV. 159 *f*.

'Agni, assuredly, is the safest among the gods: let him then have recourse to him whom he considers the safest among the gods, and therefore announce the sacrifice to Agni.

'Agni, assuredly, is the most tender-hearted of gods: let him, then, have recourse to him whom he considers the most tender-hearted of gods, and therefore announce the sacrifice to Agni.

'Agni, assuredly, is the nearest of the gods: let him then have recourse to him whom he considers the nearest to be approached, and therefore let him announce the sacrifice to Agni.'[1]

The Ṛg Vedic hymns themselves justify this view of Agni as a unifying principle among the gods. He is associated with Indra, with Varuṇa and Mitra and with Soma. 'He is Varuṇa when he is born, and Mitra when he is kindled. Agni in the evening becomes Varuṇa, rising in the morning he becomes Mitra; becoming Savitra he traverses the air, becoming Indra he illumines the sky in the midst. In one passage of the Ṛg Veda he is successively identified with about a dozen gods besides five goddesses. He assumes various divine forms, and has many names. In him are comprehended all the gods whom he surrounds as a felly the spokes.'[2] This God of manifold nature and function is said to have been born in various ways. He is produced from two sticks as a new born infant. 'Strange to say', cries the poet, 'the child as soon as born begins with unnatural voracity to consume his parents and is altogether beyond his mortal worshippers' comprehension.'[3] But for all that Agni is 'the king of all worship, the guardian of the ṛta, the shining one. Easy of access to us as a father to a son he is invoked to burn against the mischievous, against the sorcerers.' 'He drives away sickness.' 'Thou art called the guardian and father even of the weak, thou instructest the simple, thou, the greatest sage, the quarters of the world.' But strangely it is also said in the same hymn—'Thou O Agni, leadest forward the man who follows crooked ways.' In another hymn occur these noteworthy words—'Manu has established thee, O Agni, as a light for all people. Thou hast shone forth with Kañva born from ṛta, grown strong, thou whom the human races worship.' 'Whatever sin O youngest god

[1] Śatapatha Brahmana i. VI. 2 (8–11).
[2] Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 95.
[3] X. 79. 4.

we have committed against thee in thoughtlessness, men as we are, make thou us sinless before Aditi; release us from every guilt on all sides, O Agni.'[1]

But this light for all people, this purifying fire, is conceived as akin to the fire that kindles in the passions of the heart. In hymn 71 of the first Mandala of the Ṛg Veda it is said, 'When he had created sap to the great Father Heaven, the knowing one stealthily approached the speckled cows. The archer fiercely shot an arrow at him. The god turned his impetuous power against his daughter.' The meaning is obscure, but the imagery is explained by practices that are found at the present day in connexion with the holy ritual, and the passage may be taken as undoubtedly referring to the incestuous passion of Prajapati for Ushas, and as attributing that passion to the inspiration of Agni. Some modern scholars like Muir, warn us that this story of Prajapati and Ushas is not to be taken as immoral in the sense in which we may take other similar stories of the gods; but the Śatapatha Brahmana is very clear that the whole thing was wrong, for it refers to the incident as stirring up the righteous indignation of the other gods.[2] In hymn 140 of Mandala I of the Ṛg Veda, Agni is clearly conceived as the procreating passion, and so he is allied to a movement in Hindu theology which has developed a tendency that does not make for righteousness.

Agni is not only the sacrificial fire he is the altar itself. This altar was built in the form of a bird flying towards the east, and the various layers of the altar were conceived as representing the divisions of the universe. The first layer is the earth, the second is the air, the third the sky, the fourth the sacrifice, the fifth the sacrificer, the sixth the heavenly world, the seventh layer is immortality. The various parts of the altar are also conceived as symbolizing a person or puruṣa. This great puruṣa is compounded of seven other puruṣa that Indra begat, and the compound person is Prajapati who is identified with Agni—'He indeed consists of seven persons, for that person consisted of seven persons—to wit the body of four, and the wings and tail of three, for of four the body of that person consisted and of three his wings and tail.'[3] The natural conclusion of this symbolism is a more or less pantheistic view of the world. The most significant thing about the process of the idea is the deifying of the functions of the priest—'Prajapati was

[1] IV. 12. [2] S. B. I. vii, 4, 1–4. [3] S. B. X. ii. 4 of VI. i. 1, 3–6.

desirous of gaining these worlds. He saw this bird-like body, the Fire-Altar; he fashioned it, and thereby gained this terrestrial world. He saw a second bird-like body, the chant of the Great Rite; he fashioned it and thereby gained the air. He saw a third bird-like body, the Great Litany; he fashioned it and thereby gained the sky. This built Fire-Altar, doubtless is this terrestrial world, the Great Rite the air, and the Great Litany the sky; all these, the Fire-Altar, the Great Rite and the Great Litany we ought therefore to undertake together, for these worlds were created together.'[1]

Agni was one of the earliest of Aryan gods, and his worship is continued to the present day in every Brahman home, and at the important ceremonies connected with marriage and with death. He has been conceived in the full multiplicity of his appearances and functions. The literal and the symbolical have been compounded together to the confusion of the moral, the immoral and the non-moral. The symbolism is far fetched and difficult to understand, but it has much in common with other processes of primitive thought. The most reprehensible thing about it is that the priest has never lost sight of his own profit and the glorification of his calling. The final conclusion of this system of allegory is declared at the end of the *Śatapatha Brahmana*, and it is confirmed in the great secret doctrine of the *Upaniṣad*—this all is the Self. There is something of tragedy in the history of ideas regarding this most intimate and friendly of the gods. He has passed by allegory and symbolism that have lacked in the art of selection to an idea that is cold and foreign to the hearth on which the god had his birth. The taking of Agni literally in his manifold material and physiological form as modifications of the one has led to the destruction of the noble spiritual truths which some of the rishis declared—his guardianship of the ṛta, his forgiving nature and his cleansing power, his power of healing, his kindness to even the weak, his mediatorship between man and God, the fact that in him sacrificer, sacrifice and object of the sacrifice are one. One cannot help feeling that the logic which overpassed ideas like these is a cruel thing. The culmination of the moral ideas connected with this god is in theism not in pantheism. It is a kind of spiritual greed unwilling to cast aside the literal and the material that has frustrated the ethical nature of the early ideas. These ethical ideas that simmer in the

[1] S. B. X. i. 2.

mind of a people as of an individual man are divine inspirations, and like all other ideas they are truest when they are incarnate. The most permanently spiritual of the attributes and functions of Agni are perfected in the man Jesus Christ who is the Mediator of the new Covenant, who brings God and Man into union in his own person, who establishes the eternal law of righteousness making atonement for the sin of many by willingly offering himself a divine sacrifice on the altar of his own person. He is Immanuel, he is a great physician, he is the refuge of the weak.

THE TREASURE OF THE MAGI[1]

By Maneckji B. Pithawala, B.A., B.Sc.

SINCE the year 1771 when that bold French scholar Anquetil du Perron published first in Europe his book on Iranian literature, many a savant has devoted his life in whole or in part to the patient study of the ancient religious books of the Parsees. This people is a small but righteous band, the descendants of the once renowned Persian nation. They are now reaping the fruit of honest work and zealous devotion on the western coast of this great Indian peninsula under the benign protection of Britain. Among those European scholars who by their impartial studies and precious publications have made the Parsee community very grateful to them, the late Dr. James H. Moulton occupies an honourable place. Coming of a good family with traditions of learning and culture inherited through many generations he early displayed a love for the study of Greek and Persian antiquities. He read the *Gathas*, the hymns of the prophet Zoroaster, under Professor Cowell at Cambridge. He published the results of years of patient and willing study in his two earlier works, *Early Zoroastrianism* and *Early Religious Poetry of Persia.* One of his most earnest desires was to visit the fosterland of the Parsees and to come into living contact with the people whose scriptures he had so studied. This wish was gratified when lately at a ripe age he came to India and worked in many important Parsee centres. Leaving behind him a copy of the manuscript of the book under review, he sailed for Home, but alas! not the home in England. As a proud victim to the Daevayasnism of the Huns, he found through the waters of the Mediterranean his eternal rest in the Garonmana the 'House of Song' to which he so enthusiastically refers in this posthumous volume. Dr. Moulton was a precious soul, pure, truthful, and most loving, a soul that rightly realized the potentialities of this old world religious system, Zoroastrianism, as an antidote to the Mammonism of to-day.

1 By James Hope Moulton. Oxford University Press, 1917.

In the touching dedication to his most promising son whom he lost in the war Moulton writes, 'He gave his life in France for the restoration of that broken fabric the principles of which he was pledged to study.' We may well repeat the words in his own case, for in him the Parsees have begun to see a great restorer of that link between ancient Zoroastrianism and Christianity. This word is but a ladder and things that have gone before have laid the foundation of those that follow. And it was Dr. Moulton's one great object to search through the crumbling pages of the *Avesta* in order to find how much in it a devout Christian could honestly and willingly endorse.

This book is one of the best we have read on Zoroastrianism, ancient and modern. It is written with a purpose. It must at once be pointed out that although Dr. Moulton gave his very life for Zoroastrianism he was to the fullest degree a Christian.

This 'Treasure' (and it should be the more precious to the Christian world for the fact) has been restored by Dr. Moulton with a view to comparing it with the Christian commonwealth. It has indeed held in bold relief the very best that is in Zoroaster's system alongside of which many an existing minor creed seems dim and meaningless. And to go one step further still, we may say that this book has been written in fulfilment of the second of the two objects of the editors who 'seek to set each form of Indian religion by the side of Christianity in such a way that the relationship may stand out clear. Jesus Christ has become to them the light of their seeing, and they believe that He is destined to become the Light of the World.' But of this phrase more anon.

The book is divided into two sections—(1) Zoroastrianism, dealing with the pure teachings of Zarathushtra himself, the incrustations that clung to them after his death, the relations of Zoroastrianism with the outside world, and lastly the 'Magian Dogmas' imposed upon the early creed. (2) The Parsees, dealing with the customs, manners, ceremonial life and imitative reforming tendencies of the modern Parsees. The book ends with the rather surprising note that the crown of Zoroastrianism is Christianity.

The style of the book is remarkably vigorous, and the reader is easily carried away by it finding it most refreshing. In the first chapter the author begins naturally with a picture of the prophet, a real personage, not the mythical Zoroaster of Crawford or of the German Nietzche, or even the demigod of the later

Avesta. As the author himself belonged to the circle of practical philosophers he supposed Zoroaster to have been a human being but of the most exalted order. The close affinity between the *Avesta* and the Sanskrit languages is then pointed out and the conclusion is drawn that they both belong to the Indo-Aryan stock. The genealogy of the Iranian languages is also given—the Gothic, the later Avestan, the old Persian, the middle Persian or Pahlavi, and the modern Persian. The second most important and the most interesting chapter in the book deals with the great Persian prophet himself. Almost all the information we possess about him comes from the Gathas, the hymns written or dictated by the prophet or by his immediate disciples. The language—Gathic Avestan—is exceedingly archaic but poetic. There are plenty of what are called by Professor Schmiedel 'pillar passages' in the *Gathas* giving us a picture of the prophet's powerful personality,[1] with which some of the passages in the *Farvardin* and other later *Yashts* can be contrasted. The very names, like Zarathushtra (golden or old camel) Frashaostra (fresh camels), Hvogva (having fine cattle) show that they are names of some persons who lived in that pastoral age.

As to the date of Zarathushtra, Moulton contends that the Greek writers who wrote about him at least five centuries later than his day knew not the exact situation when they put him six thousand years before Xerxes. On the other hand, he does not accept the fantastic theory of that French enthusiast, Darmesteter who brought down the age of the *Gathas* to the first century before Christ. His is therefore a *via media* and according to his calculations Zarathushtra lived about 1200 B.C.

Zarathushtra was for a long time 'a voice crying in the wilderness.' The foundations of Zoroastrianism were laid in a corner, as far as civilization is concerned. Dr. Moulton supports Professor Jackson who says that 'Zarathushtra was born in Western Iran, preached there without success and then turned eastwards to win success at last in Bactria.' Nobly responding to the divine call to the prophetic office, Zarathushtra bows to Ahura Mazda, prays for the Good Mind and for righteous conduct and undertakes to carry out the divine commandment, 'To right shalt thou go for teaching.'[2] This is again a world of polar manifestations Zarathushtra at the very threshold of his prophetic career 'sees through all things earthly.' There is on one

[1] e.g. Yasna xlvi. 1, 2; xxix. 9; li. 12; xliv. 18.

[2] Yasna xliii. 12.

side the path of Asha, truth, of the Ashavano and on the other that of Druj, wrong, that of the Dregvanto. He stops for a moment at the parting of these thoroughfares and chooses between the two. Free-will is the pivot of his philosophy—there is no compulsion in the kingdom of the Divine. It may be that in the present world there is

> Truth for ever on the scaffold
> Wrong for ever on the throne

but to his piercing eyes God is absolutely just and in the other world the injustice of the present must be redressed. This Druj or Evil can be and must be destroyed. The Kingdom of God can then come on earth and the whole world will be renewed. The day of Renovation will then come at last. Spenta Mainyu and Angra Mainyu are therefore not spirits, they are not coeval with Ahura Mazda ; they are the mental conditions of all human beings, who could if they would conquer the evil, follow the right and ultimately give success to Ahura Mazda.

There is no dualism in the *Gathas* in the sense in which the term is now used in theology. Zoroaster's word for evil is not Angra Mainyu, but Druj, falsehood, and this can be easily overcome and man can attain to perfection. For Zoroaster was the most optimistic of all prophets—'If God is just and almighty He cannot tolerate the victory of wrong excepts as a means towards a greater triumph of right.'

This is one phase of the nature of Ahura Mazda—he is a benevolent, righteous and evolving God. Next came what the later *Avesta* terms Amesha Spentas, Archangels. In the *Gathas* these are on the same level as Ahura himself. Vohu Mano (good mind) Asha (righteousness), Khthravairya (right authority), Armaiti (devotion), Hvaretat and Ameretat (bliss and immortality), the facets of one rich diamond or the rainbow colours merging together into the white, the only One. These divine attributes, not archangels, in a way help us to realize the greatness and goodness of the Divine Being. In view of this statement the following most thoughtful remark of the lamented doctor is cheering to us Parsees : 'This profound thinker's instinct not only grasped the supreme truth of the Oneness of God, but realized the vital corollary—blindness to which has vitiated the monotheism of Islám—that there must be diversity within the Godhead, if the unity is to be a fruitful doctrine.'

Next comes Zoroaster's doctrine of evil. In this part of his teaching the prophet is unique, and it is this that goes to prove

the superiority of Zoroastrianism over Hinduism. Whereas the Indian followers of the old Aryan gods remaining stagnant in the waters of Theology for centuries, desired to propitiate the darker deities, Zoroaster went a step further and showed that evil can be crushed, that evil is not eternal and therefore is easily overcome. But 'Zoroaster is manifestly concerned here with the tremendous force of choice.' Any sort of compromise is impossible, knowing that all eternity depends upon the choice that we make.

We now turn to Zoroastrian Ethics. Everything here hinges on purity; pure thoughts, pure words, pure deeds form the triad of good life. 'By far the most fundamental doctrine is that which takes us down to the springs of action and makes thought of equal importance with word and deed. Thoughts, words and actions are all interdependent, and here is found the richest element in the prophet's psychology. Moreover he does not stop even at words. There is action to perform after that. Here is manifest his practicability. In this connexion it is easy to understand the elaborate treatment in the *Gathas* of the punishments of sin in the Hereafter. Again to live only a pure life is but to live imperfectly. There is the second and important part of our life—war or warfare against the wicked. Even after death the good are separated from the evil by the Chinvat Peretu (the bridge of the separator).' Merits and demerits are weighed there. 'Men go to heaven when their merits outweigh their demerits and to hell when the scale dips the other way.' Between the two states, for those whose merits and demerits are equal, there is a separate place, a kind of purgatory. It is referred to in Yasna xlviii.

According to Moulton, the *Gathas* do not deal with the Fravashis (the Forms of Plato). This doctrine is foreign and fatal to the teaching of Zoroaster. That would mean for him *ex-officio* goodness, which Zoroaster would never for a moment tolerate. His is rather a more original, fruitful contribution, viz., the doctrine of the Daena (the man's self). 'This self makes our own future, and if the Hand points downward to the quaking sinner by the bridge, it is only the endorsement of a doom the self has pronounced before.' In the spirit of this powerful and practical teaching is the beautiful conception of the later Avesta by which the angel or devil that comes to meet the deceased man's soul as it flies forth upon its last journey, is the self in the form of a lovely maiden or of a hideous hag made fairer or fouler by

every act, word or thought of the man in his earthly life. Hereby is refuted 'the most universal and mischievous of India's delusions, the doctrine of reincarnation.'

Above all 'Zoroaster held out the promise of a treasure in heaven for those who would forsake their evil ways, practise the farmer's honest and beneficial industry and cling to truth, to kindness, obedience to God in word, thought and deed.' Thus the prophet's greatness comes out amazingly in the fact that he could think deeply on the greatest of themes and then turn to the practical side of life. 'Vishtaspa may or may not have understood the lore of the Ameshaspands, but he could see the value of the new teaching for the building up of a prosperous and contented community.'

'After Zarathushtra' is the significant heading of the next chapter. We have seen that Zarathushtra was on the one hand a reformer of the old Aryan nature-worship prevalent before he took up office, and on the other hand he was a remarkable creator or inventor of new doctrines. Herein lies his greatness as a true prophet of God and it was for these reasons that he had also to suffer much in the early part of his career. Enemies he had many, and he was certainly unpopular but to be unpopular is to be truly great. How the new born Zoroastrianism suffered one can easily see from the Avestic writings of a late age.

Dr. Moulton first handles in this connexion the Haptan Yasht. The divinities male and female in gender, the stereotyping of epithets, the Aryan nature worship of fire, waters, trees, the adoration of the Fravashis, all show a marked deviation from the spirit of the Founder—tendencies which ultimately in the times of the later *Avesta* developed first in its verse portions (excellently described by our author in his *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*) and then in the perfunctory prose *Yashts*. *Haoma*, *Mithra*, *Tishtrya*, the *Fravashis*—all importation from the Semitic races, according to Moulton—are mainly worshipped therein along with their maker, Ahura Mazda. The poets of the several *Yashts* raised their own cherished divinity to the very highest pinnacle, and the marvel of marvels is that even Ahura Mazda himself is sometimes made to worship them. This may be called Henotheism, not Monotheism. To make matters worse Dr. Moulton believes that a peculiar Median tribe called the Magi comes on the scene of religious activities after Zarathushtra with its own peculiar dogmas. Some of these dogmas are, (1) the exposing of the dead to vultures, (2) the practice of next-of-kin marriage,

(3) the interpretation of dreams, (4) the practice of astrology, (5) the misunderstanding of Zarathushtra's philosophical doctrine of Spenta and Angra into a regular dualism, 'a vast game of chess' as Dr. Moulton calls it and lastly (6) the development of the elaborate Persian ritual for which the Magi are solely responsible.

The tail end of this chapter naturally runs into the fifth not the fourth one, and this re-arrangement of the book would be better. Dr. Moulton is of opinion that the religion of the modern Parsees is not the religion of the *Gathas* alone, but of the later *Avesta* tinged by the aforesaid Magian interpolations. But he goes on to say, 'No impartial outsider can help seeing that it is impossible to correlate the early and the later, giving equal weight to both. The worshipper must choose between two ideals. And as we soon have occasion to note, the modern orthodox Parsi may render lip-service to the *Gathas*; the very fact that he does not understand them makes it easier for him to use them as spells, but the whole of his outward religious life comes out of the later *Avesta*. A Parsi who modelled his religion on the *Gathas* and rejected everything that could not be at least inferentially justified from them would be unrecognizable as a Parsi.' With these words the author turns to discuss the theology of the later Avesta.

(1) The doctrine of God. There is the transcendence of Ahura Mazda over all other objects of worship. Fire is a sacramental symbol only, and there is no idolatry so far. 'Parsi religion never admitted the degrading associations which in India brought idolatry and coarse superstition into Hinduism and Buddhism.' But the doctrine of God here is impoverished by the loss of the genuine doctrine of the good attributes of God. These attributes were styled archangels and were rarely worshipped, so much so that some of the angels (lower in rank than they in reality) like Mithra, became more prominent in the Avestan angelology. Dr. Moulton examines in detail some aspects of these Yazads given in the *Yashts* and his general impression is that though monotheistic theory is intact monotheistic religion does not prevail. Hence Parseeism is but another form of Roman Catholicism.

(2) Regarding the new doctrine of the Fravashis in the later *Avesta* the author says, basing his arguments on the Farvardin *Yasht* that although these spirits have been worshipped by the Parsis, who believe that they are the spirits of the dead, of the

living and also of those yet unborn, that they revisit the homes of their beloved relatives, that at death the Fravashis and the souls unite, yet they have never been regarded by them with terror such as the thought of ghosts produced in the minds of other Eastern peoples. This doctrine naturally leads us to the idea of immortality and the Frashokereti or Renovation, which event according to the Sassanian theologians and according to Dr. West's reading of the *Pahlavi*, is to come in the year A.D. 2398 when the promised Saoshyant will make his appearance on this globe.

(3) Next is treated the doctrine of evil which according to Dr. Moulton has been very much developed since the *Gathas*. The natural corollary to this, the Zoroastrian ethical code, has been exhaustively dealt with in the *Avesta* book of the Vendidad. But as there are so many strange admixtures in this early law code of the Parsis and as Dr. Moulton says that it is full of silly rubbish we had better reserve this part of our criticism for a separate treatment. The chapter ends with the enumeration of a few Zoroastrian virtues which are depicted in the *Meher* and other *Yashts*. The first and foremost is the virtue of honest labour, and agriculture is not only a religious duty but a virtue in itself. Man and woman are put on an equal footing and the importance of the married state is clearly shown. Even one of the few Gathic hymns is a marriage song in honour of the marriage of the prophet's daughter. Conduct and character are ever in the forefront and charity is the very pivot of their social activities. Such a code is calculated to produce 'a clean living, honest and trustworthy people.' This sublime, practical religion has doubtless made the Parsi people what they are, a vital force in the regeneration of the land to which their pious ancestors came as pilgrims some 1299 years ago. Dr. Moulton, it is cheering to note, cannot help calling the *Avesta* 'really fragrant.' But how far these religious books have cast their fragrance and with what effect is the next question. Or he might curiously ask whether it has not wasted its own sweetness on the desert air, whether or not 'the *Avesta* has always been practically unknown in the outside world.'

Several European students of the *Avesta* have attempted to show that Zoroastrianism has influenced to a great extent not only Judaism but also Christianity and even Buddhism. Among these scholars Dr. Mills now occupies a foremost place. His views are published in his scholarly work entitled *Our Own*

Religion in Ancient Iran. Dr. Moulton does find some resemblances in the doctrines of Judaism and of Zoroastrianism. We can calculate the highest common factor of the two systems as Dr. Moulton humorously remarks. Then how does he account for these strange resemblances? He says that they are mere coincidences. The human mind is similarly constituted and 'great wits jump' and thus he dismisses this question with a single stroke of his pen. He does not stop even here. He tries to show also that early Zoroastrianism has failed to influence later Zoroastrianism. And the reason, he says, is obvious. 'In the thoroughly characteristic features of his system Zarathushtra was far above the heads of his contemporaries. We have to wait for centuries before the Iranian aloe flowered again'. Even his immediate successors were unable to either grasp his problems or to catch his spirit or to carry on his traditions. But in their enthusiasm to extol the messenger of Ahura they unconsciously made him a demigod, and his abstractions were made into concrete angels. The hymns which in the later ages were not understood by the priests were chanted as *mantras* or spells. Such is the easy downward path along which religion glides to self-satisfied nullity.

But it must not be surmised that Zarathushtra left no real footprint on the sands of the ten or more centuries after his passing away. In his doctrine of the Hereafter he has achieved a unique distinction and has left a real influence behind him. 'The essence of his doctrine lies in the great thought that a man's inmost self determines his future destiny and that the self that is to mould that future is moulded in turn by deeds, words and thoughts. Rewards and punishments are accordingly ethical through and through and they depend on a principle of continuity between this world and the next.' There is therefore no room for the strange doctrine of reincarnation in the *Avesta* proper. This doctrine has affected powerfully the thought of India, and it may have had some influence from Zoroastrian sources at the time of Asoka and Chandragupta. In this connexion he seems to be entirely at one with Dr. Spooner who has suggested that the Mauryan kings may have been Zoroastrians and that 'the doctrine of reincarnation owed its first impulse to the Magi and their conception of the Fravashi.'

THE MARĀTHĀ PSALMISTS

By the Rev. N. Macnicol, M.A., D. Litt.

I

IT is a remarkable fact that from the twelfth to the sixteenth century there was a quickening of religion all over India, in some of its characteristics not unlike the movement which during the same period was stirring Europe and arousing her, too, from the long sleep of the Middle Ages. The new message that was awakening India may even be described as an evangel, for it was a message which, into the midst of the formalism and fear of Hinduism brought at least some transient gleams of light and hope. There is indeed a distinct parallel between the whole history of India during this period and the periods immediately preceding and the contemporary history of Europe, and we can identify some of the causes alike of the long slumber and of the spiritual awakening that followed as the same in both continents. There had been a night of darkness and of struggle while a higher and a lower civilization were at strife; anarchy was everywhere and confusion and fear engulfed the land. Gradually order re-emerges. Here and there stable states arise that are able to establish themselves in some strength and to maintain law and government. Religion, too, is reborn and with it hope for the oppressed and some sense of unity and of the worth in the sight of God, of all men, however despised. These things are being discovered in a measure in India during this period, just as they were being discovered in Europe also, so that it seems as if, by some mysterious seasonal impulse the spirit of man, all the world over, was moving and stirring with new life. And just as the Reformation in Europe sang itself into the hearts of the people, so—and even more so—this Indian Reformation set the hearts of men singing all over India.

Who then were these singers and what was the subject of their songs? They appeared over Northern India in three main groups, each of which has a distinctive character of its own.

There is the Hindi group, perhaps the most important of all, and the widest in the range of its influence throughout the country. The two most notable of its singers and saints are Kabīr and Tulsī Dās, while not far away Mirābāī, a princess of Mewar in Rajputana sang in Gujerati verse of her love to Kṛiṣṇa. Then in Bengal there was an intensely emotional awakening, centering around the figure of the saint Caitanya. It also expressed itself in singing, and in ecstatic dancing. The third region in which this religious revival made its influence felt is the Marāthā country in Western India. There from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth a remarkable succession of poet-saints moved deeply by their songs the hearts of all classes of the people, producing a unity of feeling that for a little while even overcame the divisive influences of caste and created something like a Marāthā nation. All of these various movements of life have one characteristic in common. They may be associated with the worship of different deities—Rāma in North India, Kṛiṣṇa in Bengal, Viṭhobā in the West. But in each the character of the worship and the method of religious approach is the same. It is what is called *bhakti*, a word which it is rather difficult to define with precision, and which, no doubt, has somewhat different suggestions in different psychological climates. It usually, however, implies elements of love and trust, and these are directed towards a personal God with whom the worshipper desires communion. This type of religion is most commonly associated with Viṣṇu or one of his *avatārs* or incarnations, especially with Rāma or Kṛiṣṇa, Viṭhobā being identified with Kṛiṣṇa. Thus it attaches to the deity who—to quote the words of a *bhakta*, who was not, however, a Vaisnavite—'has drawn near to men, pitying poor souls.' It is often strongly erotic in its character—sometimes intensely emotional and even hysterical. As seen in the works of Tulsī Dās, and, still more, of Kabīr, it is much more under control and much more ethical in its tone and tendency. This is true also of the Marāthā saints whose works are almost always clean and healthy, while at the same time there rings through most of them a passionate lyrical cry for God's presence and fellowship.

Of the influences that created these poets and unsealed the fountains of this deep longing for a divine communion we can speak with no certainty. The spirit of *bhakti*, that is to say, the inextinguishable longing of the human heart for the living God, had probably never been dead in India. Its presence can be

noted from ancient times in the sacred literature. There are two books especially that may be described as the Scriptures of this movement, the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa.* The former supplies the ideas and the ethics that lie behind the emotion and give it depth and permanence; the latter, which tells the story of Kṛiṣṇa's life, furnishes the emotional stimulus and is the chief source of the impure and unhealthy elements in the religon. The *Bhagavadgītā* was translated and paraphrased in Marāthī by the earliest of the Marāthā poet-saints, Jñāneśvar, and the beginning of this religious awakening in the Marāthā area may be dated from the appearance of this work. For a while it seems to have been overlooked and forgotten, but presently another saint, Eknāth, rediscovered it and with the discovery and, no doubt, its influence upon himslf a new impetus was given to the movement. Similarly two of the Marāthā poets, Eknāth and Śridhar, rendered the *Bhāgavata Purāna* into the language of the people. These and, probably, the *Bhakti Ratnāvali,* a collection of verses from the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* made some time between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, were the sources, apparently, from which the *bhakti* awakening in the Marāthī area drew its main inspiration. The influences that moulded Kabīr and Tulsī Dās were evidently different since it is Rāma about whom their religious ardour centres. We can trace this stream as flowing to these two saints from Rāmānanda, who came from South India to Benares and set up there a 'school of the prophets' to which they belonged. He again derives from the great South Indian theologian of *bhakti,* Rāmānuja. At the same time Kabīr, it is evident, owes much to Muḥammadanism. In the case of Mirābāī and of Caitanya and his followers the sensuous tales of Kṛiṣṇa and his loves, as related in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* undoubtedly supply the stimulus of their unrestrained emotionalism.

It is, however, with the Marāthā poets and the work that they accomplished that we are here concerned. In its influence upon all strata of society this movement, in the opinion of Mr. M. G. Ranade, was far more powerful than the corresponding movement in Northern and Eastern India. Certainly its leaders were drawn from every class from the highest to the humblest, 'Roughly speaking,' says Mr. Ranade in his *Rise of the Marāthā Power,* 'we may state that the history of the religious revival in Mahārāṣṭra covers a period of nearly five hundred years and during this period some fifty saints and

prophets flourished in this land who left their mark upon the country and its people. A few of these saints were women, a few were Muḥammadan converts to Hinduism, nearly half of them were Brāhmans, while there were representatives in the other half from among all the other castes, Marāthās, *kunbis*, tailors, gardeners, potters, goldsmiths, repentant prostitutes, and slave girls, even the outcaste Mahārs.' By the traditional account of some of these saints and as well as by a study of their voluminous poems we can form some conception of the character of this remarkable movement.

The earliest of them all, a dimly discerned but powerful figure, is a Brahman, named Jñāneśvar, whose chief work, the *Jñāneśvarī*, can be dated with certainty, having been completed in the year A.D. 1290. 'Jñāneśvar's influence', says Mr. Ranade, 'has been greater than that of any other Marāthā *sādhu* (saint) except Tukārām . . . Jñāneśvar appeals to the pantheistic tendencies of our people's intellect, while the charm of Tukārām and Nāmdev lies in their appeal to the heart and in the subjective truth of the experiences felt by them in common with all who are religious by nature.' To the common people the author of the *Jñāneśvarī* is little more than the shadow of a great name, but it is a name that is linked with that of Tukārām in the songs that they sing as they go on pilgrimage to the shrine at Paṇḍharpūr around which all this movement centres. As they go up to the high place of festival in that Deccan village desiring to 'see the face' of Viṭhobā, the god who awakened this intense devotion, they chant two names in chorus, as the names of the chief prophets of their faith, 'Jñānobā, Tukārām, Jñānobā, Tukārām.' These two, the one in the thirteenth and the other in the seventeenth century, may, with Nāmdev, whom we may place between them in the fourteenth century, be taken as representative in their life and in their influence, of the whole of this social and religious quickening in the Marāthā country. From the traditional accounts of these saints—even though these are largely legendary and unreliable—as well as from the specimens of their voluminous poems that are translated here we may be able to form some conception of the character of this remarkable movement.

The life of Jñāneśvar is surrounded by many obscurities. Even the name Jñāneśvar or Jñāndev, by which he is commonly known, may quite possibly be a honorific title, given to him because of his eminence as a religious teacher, and not his actual

name at all. Much controversy has centred round the question whether there were not really two Jñāneśvars, the one the author of the *Jñāneśvarī* and the *Amṛit Anubhāv*—both of them poems of a philosophical or theological character—the other the author of *abhangs* or short lyrics, the utterances of a much more popular and personal religion. The question is one which cannot be investigated here, but it must be admitted that the hypothesis that there were really two of the name resolves some difficulties which the traditional history undoubtedly presents. If, however, we accept the traditional account this Brāhman poet belonged to Ālandī, a village twelve miles north of Poona. His father had come there when on pilgrimage and had married a woman of the place, but, presently, he resumed his wandering, and proceeded to Benares. There, renouncing the life of a house-holder, he became a disciple of Swāmī Rāmānanda, a teacher of the Rāmānuja sect. There is a chronological impossibility here if we are to suppose that by this Rāmānanda is meant the famous *guru* of Kabīr, but, however that may be, the story is that shortly afterwards the *sannyāsī* in defiance of religious law and usage, resumed his family duties and returned to Ālandī. Three sons and a daughter were born to him but when this grave irregularity of conduct was known he was excommunicated. The persecution that he and his wife had to endure is said to have caused them to commit suicide, but their inheritance of trouble passed to the children who suffered much at the hands of the Brāhmans.

Jñāneśvar's two brothers, Nivṛittināth, who was the eldest of the family, and Sopāndev, and his sister, Muktābāī, are all said to have been, like himself, saints and poets. Some of the legendary tales that have been handed down furnish indications of the conflict with Brahmanical authority and orthodoxy which evidently centred around these '*sannyasī's* children.' Jñāneśvar is said to have confounded his Brāhman persecutors by causing a buffalo to recite the Vedas, though these are scriptures that only the twice-born may read. He is alleged on another occasion to have gone riding on a wall to meet a famous Brāhman *yogī* and miracle-worker who, to impress young heretics, was approaching him riding on a tiger with a snake for a whip.

There are legends, on the other hand, that seem to suggest that Jñāneśvar was believed to have been himself an adept in *yoga* practice. One tale, for example, relates how, when they, as outcastes, were refused facilities for cooking, Muktābāī baked bread on Jñāneśvar's back, which he by the *yoga*-fire within him

4

had made red-hot. On another occasion when travelling with Nāmdev he is said to have taken the form of a bird and flow into a well to satisfy his thirst. For he is said to have journeyed to Paṇḍharpūr where dwelt this other poet-saint, famous for his intense devotion to Viṭhobā. The two saints are said to have gone together on pilgrimage from there along with a company of like-minded devotees of that god, men belonging to various castes. Besides Jñāneśvar, the Brāhman, and Nāmdev, the tailor, there were a goldsmith, a gardener, a potter, and even two outcastes. Jñāneśvar lies buried at Ālandī, and to the temple built over his grave thousands of pilgrims resort every year at the time of the festival that is observed in his honour.

The work upon which Jñāneśvar's fame chiefly rests is the *Jñāneśvarī*, a free and copious paraphrase in Marāthī verse of the *Bhagavadgītā*. The seven hundred *slokas* of the *Gītā* are here expanded into ten thousand verses. This poem forms perhaps the most important work in all Marāthī literature and has exercised a unique influence both upon the thought and upon the language of Mahārāṣṭra. The fact that Jñāneśvar used the people's language to convey thoughts hitherto concealed in Sanskrit and so reserved for the learned was in itself an indication that a new religious spirit was abroad. What he did for Marāthī has been compared to what Dante did for Italian. He loved the 'national Marāthī speech' and showed how it could convey sweet sounds and 'clear thoughts like moonlight' and how in his verse 'lotus flowers spring up in such abundance.' 'All the weight and distinction that the Marāthī language possesses', says Mr. M. G. Ranade, it owes to Jñāneśvar . . . To realize the depth of meaning that is contained in the language one must study the *Jñāneśvarī*.

The poem opens with an invocation of 'the primeval self-knowing one,' and throughout the poem the lesser gods have little place. The aboriginal worships, those, for example, of the *Vetal* and of Malhārī or Khandobā, are denounced as contemptible and evil.

In Chapter IX he denounces the worship of many gods besides the Supreme God as senseless and in another passage he describes with scorn those who are continually hurrying from god to god and from ritual to ritual. These are, he says, 'the very embodiments of ignorance.' On the other hand, he treats the *yoga* doctrine, as presented in the *Gītā*, with such fulness and evident knowledge that we are justified in concluding that

he was specially interested in it and attracted to it. The succession of his *gurus* seems to indicate that he belonged to the *Nāth Panth*, a religious school that its name suggests may have been occupied with the study and practice of this occult science. As we have seen, his legendary history relates incidents which indicate that he was believed to possess such powers as *yoga* is said to be able to bestow. At the same time, as we have seen, he is said to have confounded the pretensions of a *yoga* adept who had obtained a great following. Perhaps we may see in Jñāneśvar a *yoga* which had ministered wholly to superstition and pride being subdued to the aims of a genuine religion of *bhakti*. There seems to be a consciousness in Jñāneśvar and the *gurus* of his line that preceded him that they had a message of deliverance for men. Śrī Gahininātb, it is said, gave a charge to Nivṛittināth, 'Haste with all speed and bear this splendour without fail to beings consumed by Kali'. Nivṛittināth heard the command with joy, and did so. Then he chose as his successor Jñāneśvar. He with the humility that marks a true prophet laments, 'What capacity have I to write a book? But in verity Gurunāth inspired me with the purpose and so, see, by means of a poem has saved the world.'

DISCUSSION

Was Christ Crucified on a Friday?

By L. D. SwamiKannu

BY the courtesy of a friend my attention has been drawn to an article by the Rev. Dr. J. C. Young in the *Indian Interpreter* for April 1918 with an invitation that I might write something to follow that article up.

The subject of the actual year and date of Christ's crucifixion is one of intense and fascinating interest to every Christian student, but in my humble opinion the week-day on which that event occurred is far too well established and any attempt to disturb that tradition has for me, I confess, not even an academical interest.

We must approach historical questions in an historical spirit and the traditions of the times immediately following our Lord's earthly mission must command the greatest respect. This is how the masterly summary in the *Encyclopædia Britannica —art. Bible—N.T. Chronology* [1] views it, and that article sums up the week-day question thus: 'The Resurrection on the first day of the week—Sunday—was on the third day after the crucifixion, and that the third day implies an interval of only two days hardly needed to be shown, but has been shown to demonstration in *Field's Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* (on Matt. xvi. 21). The crucifixion was therefore on a Friday in some year between A.D. 28 and 33 inclusive.'

But Dr. Young boldly questions 'any tradition that was produced for the first time more than a hundred years after the events took place' (evidently referring to the clear statement by St. Justin the Martyr—*circa* A.D. 150 that our Lord was crucified on the day before Saturday).

But what has Dr. Young to show to the contrary? I have tabulated his calculations in the accompanying table and compared them with (1) Dr. Grattan Guinness' New Moons—1622

[1] Vol. iii, p. 390.

B.C. to A.D. 1934—a most reliable publication, in which the new moons mean as well as actual have been calculated to Jerusalem civil time and (2) my own *Indian Chronology*, in which the calculations are made with reference to the longitude of Ujjain (76° E. of Greenwich) and consequently there would be a difference of nearly two hours—between Jerusalem civil time (reckoned from midnight) and Indian civil time (reckoned from 6 a.m.)

I find that while Dr. Young's week-days for the new moon of Nisan are right, his days of the month are nearly all wrong. He evidently supposes the state of the calendar to have been the same in A.D. 29 as it is to-day and omits to take note of the corrections introduced by the Gregorian Calendar. Possibly his defence is that only his week-days matter and that he did not wish to complicate his calculations but why should he make the following patent mistake?

'In 1888 solar years there are 689,587 days, 6 hours while in 1945$\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{2}$ years there are 699,568 days, 19 hours. . . . . Consequently the new moon must have been eighteen days later in the year A.D. 30 than it was this year, i.e. it must have begun on March 30.' Surely the new moon in A.D. 30 must have been eighteen days *earlier* or twelve days later than in A.D. 1918, and this would have taken him to March 22 which, as a reference to Dr. Guinness or my *Indian Chronology*, will show was the day of mean new moon in March, A.D. 30.

But Dr. Young is guilty of more errors than the above. In controverting one of the best established points in the chronology of the New Testament, he ought to have been very careful in testing his own astronomical data; whereas precisely where he had to be most careful, he is careless. Where, for instance, did he get his notion that 'the new moon must have begun about midnight on Wednesday' (in A.D. 30) 'but could not have been seen in Jerusalem before Thursday night.' His whole position turns upon an inference from this statement, because unless the *phasis* or first appearance of the crescent on the first evening of Nisan was possible on a Thursday, the end of the 13th Nisan could not have been on Wednesday evening which he fixes as the preparation for the Passover of that year.

Now Dr. Young is right in saying that in March of A.D. 30 the new moon was on a Wednesday about midnight. It was not actually midnight but about 9.30 p.m. by all authorities. But

after such a new moon the first crescent could not possibly be visible the next day but the phasis must certainly be on the third day after, i.e. on Friday; and if the phasis was on Friday evening then the evening between the 13th and 14th which was the beginning of the preparation would have been on Thursday and the 14th or the preparation itself would have been Friday —which is what everybody except Dr. Young believes to have been the case.

Nobody ought to enter on such researches without making himself thoroughly acquainted with the astronomical conditions necessary for a *phasis* or first appearance of the moon on a particular day. [The conditions are stated in language which any Indian can understand at page 59 of my *Indian Chronology*, S. 127]. Evidence may well have been taken as to the day on which the first crescent appeared but no amount of evidence could show the moon to be visible on a day on which astronomically it was impossible to have seen it.

Again, Dr. Young, while calculating mean new moons after a fashion, does not even once refer to actual new moons, between one of which and the corresponding moment of mean new moon there may be a difference of fourteen hours. In A.D. 28 Dr. Young says that Monday night was the first phasis whereas Monday 3 a.m. was, according to Dr. Guinness, the actual moment of new moon at Jerusalem. In this case Dr. Young merely notes that Sunday was the day of new moon. No doubt Sunday was the day of *mean* new moon but Monday was the actual new moon and of course Monday could not also have been the day of phasis or first crescent. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* says that in this year Monday evening March 29 was the beginning of the preparation whereas according to Dr. Young the beginning of preparation was on Sunday.

Table comparing Rev. Dr. Young's dates with those in Dr. Grattan Guinness' *New Moons* and the present writer's *Indian Chronology* :—

—		New Moon: Mean	New Moon: Actual (Acc. to Dr. Guinness' Tables
A.D. 1913	Rev. Dr. Young.	Tues., Mar. 12.	..
	Dr. Guinness (Jer. time) ..	Tues., Mar. 12, 17 hrs. 49 min.	Mar. 12, 22 hrs. 39 min.
	Indian Chronology. (Ind. time).	Tues., Mar. 12, 14 hrs. 10 min.	
A.D. 28	Rev. Dr. Young ..	Sun., Mar. 12	Monday, March 15, 3 hrs. 25 min.
	Dr. Guinness ..	Sun., Mar. 14, 15 hrs. 11 min.	
	Indian Chronology.	Sun., Mar. 14, 13 hrs. 30 min.	
A.D. 29	Rev. Dr. Young ..	Sat., Apl. 1, 6.52 p.m. (Jer. time)	Saturday, April 2, 21 hrs. 15 min.
	Dr. Guinness ..	Sat., Apl. 2, 12 hrs. 44 min.	
	Indian Chronology.	Sat., Apl. 2, 11 hrs. 0 min.	
A.D. 30	Rev. Dr. Young ..	Wed., Mar. 30 midnight	Wednesday, March 22, 21 hrs. 30 min.
	Dr. Guinness ..	Wed., Mar. 22, 21 hrs. 33 min.	
	Indian Chronology.	Wed., Mar. 22, 20 hrs. 0 min.	
A.D. 31	Rev. Dr. Young ..	Mon., 11.10 a.m.	Monday, March 12, 0 hrs. 55 min.
	Dr. Guinness ..	Mon., Mar. 12, 6 hrs. 21 min.	
	Indian Chronology.	Mon., Mar. 12, 4 hrs. 45 min.	
A.D. 33	Rev. Dr. Young ..	....	..
	Dr. Guinness ..	Thurs., Mar. 19, 12 hrs. 42 min.	..
	Indian Chronology.	Thurs., Mar. 19, 11 hrs. 0 min.	..

—	Beginning of Nisan	Beginning of preparation of Passover
		(Evening between 13th and 14th Nisan)
A.D. 28 Rev. Dr. Young ..	Monday night ..	(Dr. Y.) Sunday, March 26 (*Ency. Brit.*) Monday, March 29.
A.D. 29 Rev. Dr. Young ..	Sunday sunset ..	(Dr. Y.) Saturday, April 14. (*Ency. Brit.*) Friday, March 18; Sunday, April 17
A.D. 30 Rev. Dr. Young ..	Thursday, April 1.	(Dr. Y.) Wednesday, April 14 (*Ency. Brit.*) Thursday, April 6.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF RECONCILIATION

By the Rev. N. Macnicol, M.A., D. Litt.

THERE is no profounder or more disquieting fact in human life than the fact of discord at the heart of things. Every one who thinks and feels is aware—in all ages and in all lands men have been aware, that there is a harsh and distressing dissonance in the universe from which it is man's deepest desire to escape to some region of harmony. In this lies the impulse that sets men seeking beauty, 'the divine Beauty,' as Plato calls it, 'pure, clear and unalloyed, not clogged with the pollutions of mortality.' This also it is that, in a world of disharmony, inspires the great musician and the poet,

> the hand that wrings,
> Bruised albeit at the strings,
> Music from the heart of things.

'It is the pang of separation,' says Sir Rabindranath Tagore, 'that spreads throughout the world and gives birth to shapes innumerable in the infinite sky. It is this sorrow of separation that gazes in silence all night from star to star and becomes lyric among rustling leaves in rainy darkness of July. It is this overspreading pain that deepens into loves and desires, into sufferings and joys in human homes; and this it is that ever melts and flows in song through my poet's heart.'

And this same quest and desire is found, as was to be expected, to be present must powerfully of all at the centre of every religion of the spirit. But here what was before conceived as estrangement from the universe is realized more or less clearly as estrangement from God, whose are the universe's laws and who is the source and author of its harmony. In so far as this is so religion will have set to it as its profoundest problem the reconciliation of men to the universe and to God, and will seek as its supreme reward the sense of harmony restored, of home-coming, of peace on the bosom of a Father. Every great religion has sought this road of reconcilement. To many of the great sages it appeared as no more than submission to the necessities of things as inexorable. 'I am at one with everything, O Universe,' said Marcus Aurelius, 'which is well fitting in thee. Nothing is early as late which is timely in thee.' This acceptance of what cannot be evaded, the Stoic *apatheia*, does not, however, satisfy. There must surely in God's universe be a way of peace more fit for human feet. 'When all thought of the self is dead, then this mortal shall become immortal.' Ah, but how shall we slay that enemy, so hard to slay, that enemy possessed of innumerable lives?

This, then, is the task of religion, to reconcile man to God and to God's universe. The Christian Gospel maintains that this has been done through the Lord Jesus Christ. He is our peace. The reconciliation is not perfected until 'we are reconciled also to our fellows, to the order of providence and to the inexorable laws of the spiritual world,' but all this is present in promise and potency in the experience which to the Christian is mediated by the love of Christ in His Cross. That is the innermost spring of the harmonious life, the life which is tranquillity and strength and music because it means the end of man's estrangement.

There is no Christian student who in recent years has given himself with such conviction to the elucidation and proclamation of this central truth of Christianity as has the late Principal James Denney. By his Christian character as well as by the power of his personality he had obtained in Scotland a position of unique authority. His death last year was felt by the whole country as an irreplaceable bereavement. When the need seemed greatest for those who could speak, as he spoke, with prophetic power, he was taken. The only mitigation of the loss is in the memory of a life singularly sincere, unfalteringly faithful, and in our possession of the books in which he embodied his message. These are mainly occupied with the endeavour to understand more deeply the significance of the death of Christ. There, he was convinced, was laid up the secret of Jesus, the key to the world's saving. He had just completed when he died one more work treating of this subject, a series of lectures which he was never able to deliver on the Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation.[1] An examination of this book and of Dr. Denney's statement of how 'Jesus in His death has been the supreme power by which men have been reconciled to God,' should certainly prove, at the very least, stimulating to mind and conscience.

Of course the *differentia* of the Christian reconciliation lies in the conviction that sin is the source of estrangement; the heart of the reconciliation consists in the forgiveness of sins. If the fact of sin is denied, then the whole message of the Cross is meaningless. If the burden of sin is reckoned to be light and the way of release from it easy, then the task of the Cross will be but lightly esteemed. That is not the spirit in which the problem is here approached. Sin is a fact of tremendous tragedy. A generation trained upon natural science is apt to extenuate sin, to ascribe it to heredity, to environment, to irresistible natural impulses, which will be outgrown and had best be forgotten; it is not thought of in any serious way as creating a responsibility which must be faced as all it is before the weight of it can be lifted from the conscience. As against all such dispositions the New Testament and the Christian conscience support Anselm when he says, 'Nondum considerasti quantum ponderis sit peccatum' (Thou hast not yet realized how heavy is

[1] *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation* (The Cunningham Lectures for 1917). By the Rev. James Denney, D.D., London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1917, pp. 332. Price, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

the weight of sin). 'To do wrong gives us a bad conscience . . . and a bad conscience induces moral paralysis. . . . It relaxes and ultimately destroys the nerve of moral effort.' 'The saintliest man has in his own bosom the key to all that can ever appal him in the world. . . . What I call my nature is in some kind of antagonism to the laws of the moral world and sin in me is as deep as being.' And for that sin I am responsible. 'Something in sin may be determined by the law of evolution, but not the very thing that makes it sin. . . . That which constitutes the sinfulness of sin, even when it is seen in the perspective of a natural evolution, is something which to conscience—and conscience is the only judge—is incommensurable with anything in nature.' Therefore we need redemption, but therefore also we can be redeemed. From the same root spring our despair and our hope.

Now if this be a true account, if sin be a thing so terrible and so deeply rooted, and all the more terrible because it is not the individual's concern alone, but passes from him abroad to a whole Society to which he in his guilt is bound—if this be so, how difficult, but, if not impossible, how amazing, would be forgiveness. It may well be true that 'every one who knows what it is to be forgiven knows also that forgiveness is the greatest regenerative force in the life of man.' Whence, then, does this experience come to the Christian—and does it rest upon foundations of reality? It is something that has been linked through all the Christian centuries with the love of Jesus, and especially with that love as seen in His Cross. It was so to the first Christians who stood on the slopes of Calvary. 'As they looked at Jesus on His Cross they became conscious through Him of a love which passes knowledge; it flashed out from His passion and overcame them; they were suddenly aware of a goodness which outweighed all the sin of the world and made it impotent; and through that goodness, or rather through Him in whose passion it was manifested to men, they were reconciled to God.' 'The last reality is beyond sin. It is a love which submits to all that sin can do, yet does not deny itself, but loves the sinful through it all. It is a love which in Scripture language bears sin, yet receives and regenerates sinners. . . . His death dispels the despairing conviction that for us sin is the last of all things, in which we must hopelessly acquiesce, and evokes the inspiring conviction that the last of all things is sin-bearing love through which the sinner may be reconciled to God.'

That is the experience of reconciliation. It involves many consequences that are only gradually disclosed. It cannot remain as an individual and inward experience; it must issue in healing power flowing forth upon a sin-stricken world. It teaches resignation to those painful and disabling consequences of sin which cannot be escaped, but which are now known and accepted as the chastisement of a loving Father. The scope of its effects must ever go on widening in range, its influence ever deepening in its significance to the forgiven heart. These things have to be learned by one who is now submitted to the teaching of the unforgettable love of God. Faith is the new disciple's attitude and

spirit. 'It is faith as a passion in which the whole being of man is caught up and abandoned unconditionally to the love revealed in the Saviour; faith to which love is integral because it is in itself a response to a love which passes knowledge.' 'Faith in Christ who died for us is a power so strong that through it we are, so to speak, lost in Him. The feeble stream of our life with all its aimless eddies and wanderings is caught up and carried forward in the mighty stream of His eternal life.'

But we must ask what the foundations are upon which rests this experience, so vivid and so powerful in its effects. Will they bear a weight so tremendous? 'He hath made peace', says St. Paul, 'by the blood of His Cross.' Is it a real or a delusive peace? What are its credentials? The proofs of a spiritual truth are not such as would be demanded in a court of law. They belong to a higher order of things and appeal to that in man which, while it includes his understanding, goes beyond it. What Dr. Denney especially insists upon in respect of this method of reconciliation is its purely ethical character. It is throughout made and fashioned from stuff o' the conscience. It lays hold of the conscience and cleanses and renews it. And there is nothing in the universe so final and so absolute as conscience. This is a postulate of all his argument, that the moral world is the eternal world. This method of reconciliation is not to be interpreted in terms of legalism on the one hand, nor yet in terms of metaphysics on the other. 'From beginning to end the work is carried on in the moral world. The power which Christ exercises in reconciling us to God is a moral power, not a physical or magical one, and in its operation it is subject to the laws of a moral order.' 'He was completely identified with His members in all their interests and fortunes.' But this identification is not metaphysical, it is ethical. It is not one with the assumption of flesh by the Word, it is the supreme achievement of the love of Christ for sinners. 'It is the *ne plus ultra* of love, the utmost reach of its moral passion. And it is by something correspondingly intense and ethical that we become one with Him, and share in the benefits of His passion. . . . Nothing but love wins and reconciles.' He has no patience with what he calls 'fancy questions'; it is whatever has to do with the making or the marring of conscience, whatever touches the real world, which is the moral world, that engages his passionate interest first and last. And that is the region of Christ and of Christ's Cross. 'It is not His being essentially and metaphysically one with us which counts in the Gospel—to such words most people who need salvation have difficulty in attaching any meaning; it is His free self-identification with us as condemned and unsheltered men in which His whole power lies. Christ's union with us is a union in love, and our union with Him is a union in the faith evoked by this love. As long as we occupy this ground we know that we are in the real moral world. We have fact and experience to stand upon.' 'In the last resort, nothing reconciles but love, and what the soul needs, which has been alienated from God by sin and is suffering

under the divine reaction against it, is the manifestation of a love that can assure it that neither the sin itself nor the soul's condemnation of it, nor even the divine reaction against it culminating in death, is the last reality in the universe; the last reality is rather love itself, making our sin its own in all its reality, submitting as one with us to all the divine reactions against it, and loving us to the end through it and in spite of it. Reconciliation is achieved when such a love is manifested, and when, in spite of guilt, distrust, and fear, it wins the confidence of the sinful.'

It is in the interest of the moral life again that Dr. Denney warns us against an interpretation of God's forgiveness which would make man God's chief end, instead of God being man's chief end. God's forgiveness is absolutely free, but because it is ethical it is not unconditioned. There are 'divine ethical necessities' which claim and receive homage from Christ in His work of reconciliation. 'This type of religion,' he says, and his words need to be pondered both by Christians and by Indian Theists, 'becomes hedonist rather than ethical; there is a loss of reverence, of awe, of solemn worship, of concentration on the moral life.' In this connexion he speaks repeatedly of 'the inexorable reactions of the divine nature against sin.' This brings us to consideration of a profound aspect of his explanation of the meaning of the Cross of Christ. Conscience, he will have us remember—and this is an axiom of Christianity—is not subjective. 'It is the most objective and independent authority of which we have any knowledge, and its very being would be denied if we questioned the objectivity of a divine reaction against evil pervading the whole nature of things.' Therefore it is true to say not only that man is to be reconciled to God, but that God is to be reconciled to man. This is not to put bounds to the divine love. 'It is possible at the same time to love and to be justly estranged; yes, and at the same time also to work for the winning again of the offender against love. . . . God has experiences in His love. To have His love wounded by sin is one, and to forgive sin is another. . . . God is not reconciled in the sense that something is won from Him for us against His will, but in the sense that His will to bless us is realized, as it was not before, on the basis of what Christ has done and of our appropriation of it.' This is what is meant by saying that Christ's is an 'objective atonement,' that is, He by His death made not only a difference in our thought of God, but in God's real relation to us. 'Reduced to its simplest expression, what an objective atonement means is that but for Christ and His passion God would not *be* to us what He is.' Christ has made this difference; not in God's love to sinners but in God's attitude to them. 'The divine love, says another great exponent of this subject, "while as love," it is unchanging, yet must, because of its very nature, ever change in the look with which it regards us according to our changing selves.'

This objective atonement is what is implied in such a saying as that He 'bore our sins in His own body on the tree.' 'It is a fundamental truth of His spiritual life that sin is only forgiven as it is borne.' 'The goodness of Jesus has the redeeming virtue

which unquestionably belongs to it just because love is the soul of it, love which in its very nature makes the burdens of others its own, whatever these burdens be. If sin is the most fatal and crushing of all, then sin will weigh heaviest upon Him.' 'While the agony and the passion were not penal in the sense of coming upon Jesus through a bad conscience, or making Him the personal object of divine wrath, they were penal in the sense that in that dark hour he had to realize to the full the divine reaction against sin in the race in which He was incorporated, and that without doing so to the uttermost He could not have been the redeemer of that race from sin, or the reconciler of sinful men to God.' We have to look at the life and death of Christ from the side of the divine order—'of the constitution of the world as a system in which there is an unceasing, dreadful, and finally fatal reaction against sin.' 'There is no getting past the fact that His sufferings had to do with sin. But they came on Him, not only because He would not sin, not only because He resisted unto blood, striving victoriously against sin, but because the world had sinned, and in becoming part of the world He stood committed to experience as its Saviour everything in which the divine reaction against sin is brought home to the soul. The cup the Father put into His hand, the cup of trembling from which He shrank in deadly fear . . . was the cup our sins had mingled. . . . If He had not *died* for us, He would have done nothing at all, for of what use to sinful, mortal men would be a Saviour who did not know what sin and death mean when they combine, as they do, to crush poor human nature? And if He had not died for us *in love*, He would have done nothing at all; for it is only love, holding out unimpaired through sin and death, and identifying itself at once with God, who inexorably repels sin and yearns with infinite longing over the sinner, and with man, who is lost in sin and death and yet remains capable of redemption, which is able to win for itself and for the God whom it reveals the faith of creatures sinking beneath the indivisible burden of guilt and mortality.'

These then are some of the great deeps into which this Christian thinker has cast his plummet. He may have erred in some aspects of his interpretation. Who can walk with assurance in these high places? But we know that he never deals with this subject otherwise than in utter seriousness, utter sincerity, and his moral insight is such as is the possession only of one walking ever near to Christ. He knows now the truth of these things, beyond all reach of error. As one reads this legacy that he has left us, one feels in regard to it what he himself says of a book on the same subject by another great student of it, McLeod Campbell, that 'it is completely inspired by the spirit of the truth with which it deals.' 'There is a reconciling power of Christ' in this book also 'to which no tormented conscience can be insensible.' 'In speculative power' we may say, as he says of the earlier writer, 'he cannot be compared to Schleiermacher, nor in historical learning to Ritschl, . . . but he walks in the light all the time, and everything he touches lives.'

REVIEW

Faith, War and Policy[1]

THE British Empire owes much to Professor Gilbert Murray. That may seem exaggerated language to use of a man whose name is known only to a very small minority of the British people. He is not a leading statesman, nor a popular figure; he is merely a Professor of Greek. But more perhaps than any other man Professor Gilbert Murray, since the beginning of the present war, has uttered the best mind of Great Britain about the ideals which have drawn the nation into this hideous conflict, has again and again recalled them to our memory when they were being forgotten, and has helped us by reason of the faith that they inspired to 'carry on' even in the darkest hour, and 'not to despair of the Republic.' That is a great achievement and those who are aware of it owe a deep debt to this clear-eyed and courageous scholar. In this volume have been collected a number of lectures and essays, written or delivered in Great Britain and America and all of them inspired by the spirit in which alone the war can be in any true sense won. It is a great refreshment, at a time when weariness is settling 'heavy as frost' upon the spirit, and when our vision of the ideals that four years ago shone before us is becoming blurred and dim, to hear again the quiet tones of Professor Murray bidding us remember and be steadfast. He has no illusions as to the horrors of the present and the exhaustion of the future and yet he is sure—and he helps us to be sure—that if the nation endures to the end and achieves a peace 'containing in it the seeds of freedom and of brotherhood,' 'then indeed the men of this poor, bloodstained generation may utter their *Nunc Dimittis* and their graves be remembered with a blessing rather than a curse.'

1 *Faith, War and Policy*: Lectures and Essays, by Gilbert Murray, Oxford University Press, 1918.

Professor Murray is no lover of war. He toiled for peace and for an understanding with Germany for many a year. He is the translator into wonderful verse of the *Trojan Women* of Euripides, one of the most powerful peace-pamphlets ever issued, but he sees that to be defeated by Germany is 'to lie at the mercy of the most ruthless and consistently evil power that has arisen in Europe since the Dark Ages' and therefore he sees nothing for it but 'to fight and endure like grim death.'

There are addresses in this volume to various races and dealing with various problems, but all of them deal with these problems as seen in the great 'awakening light' of the war. One is an address to Indian students. 'As the Germans have pointed out,' he says to them, 'there are between you and us the seeds of disunion. Of course there are, any one can see them. But there are seeds of brotherhood as well. . . . We must see to it that the seeds of disunion die while the others ripen.' Others are addressed to American audiences in the days before America had 'come in'. Professor Murray refers to the many bitter things that were said of Americans in these days and how many of them, hearing them, smiled sadly, reflecting that people who are suffering cannot help being irritable. But some Americans took another way of answering and the answer was not undeserved. 'A placard over a certain large cinema show in New York once put the point neatly: "Englishmen! Your king and country want you. We don't."' That was perhaps a fair retort and we can afford to smile at it now, but Professor Murray speaks to his audience at other times in sterner mood. 'We cannot ask the Americans to stand in our shoes; but I would like them to know and fully realize, that, by Heaven, we would not stand in theirs, nor in any others than our own. . . . We are the sailors in the ship of Humanity, the sailors and the engineers. We may yet be swept off the deck; we may be crushed or stifled in the engine-room; but at least we are not mere passengers and we are not spectators.' We can read in his preface what an encouragement and satisfaction it was to him when America took her place upon that deck.

One of the most moving of these addresses is on 'The Evil and the Good of the War' and was delivered to the Congress of Free Churches. Professor Murray there reviews in the first place the hideous mass of evil that this catastrophe is piling up for us and for the world, the tale of suffering, the suffering of men and women and children and dumb animals—a tale that can never be fully told to the end of time—the broken lives, those for whom 'the

spring has been taken out of their year,' the loss in money, that seems by comparison trivial, but that means so many schemes of reform blown to the four winds, and, worst of all, the spiritual degradation and deformment, which the spirit of hatred that has been unchained must beget. These things may well appal us; they ought to appal us: and yet, 'Have I any doubt in any corner of my mind', he asks, 'that the war was right? I have none . . . . The war is not an indulgence of our evil passions; the war is a martyrdom.' 'As for me personally, there is one thought that is always with me as, no doubt, it is with us all—the thought that other men are dying for me, better men, younger, with more hope in their lives, many of them men whom I have taught and loved. . . Some of you will be orthodox Christians and will be familiar with the thought of One who loved you dying for you. I would like to say that I seem to be familiar with the feeling that something innocent, something great, something that loves me, has died, and is dying for me daily.'

To read these addresses is to have one's spirit, grimy and bruised with contact with the evil things that have been abroad in these last four years, cleansed and restored. They lift up one's eyes to the hills: they teach us to look to the end, not merely the bitter or triumphant end that arms can achieve—but one remoter and more sure. One reason for his confidence in the present is his belief—encouraged by the publication of the *Labour Memorandum on War Aims*, that 'monument of balanced common-sense and idealism, in the essential sense of justice and the pity for suffering humanity which are strong in the rank and file of labouring men.' We can have confidence in the future because we believe in a God 'behind the shadows'. We can say what was said by a German—a good German—as he stood in a hospital looking at the lines of shattered bodies, the result of some one's wickedness—'This is a hideous war, and there is one who will judge it who is neither German nor Englishman.'

N.M.